

## **REMARKS**

**[0007]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-13, 16-24, 26, 33-35, 37-38 and 43 are currently pending.
- Claims 14-15, 27-28, 36, 39-42 are canceled herein.
- Claims 25, 29 - 32 are withdrawn herein.
- Claim 43 is added herein.
- Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 26, 33-35 are amended herein.

### **Claim Amendments**

**[0008]** Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 8-10, 13, 16, 18-19, 21, 23-24, 26, and 33-35 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and to more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting what is claimed in response to the cited references. Support for these amendments can be found in the Specification in at least page 7, line 9; page 8, line 14; page 10, line 3 and page 20, line 12.

### **Claims 8-10, 18, 19, 21-24, and 26-28 Comply With § 112 1st Paragraph**

**[0009]** Claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner

stated, “[a] single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.” See, *Office Action at page 3*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**[00010]** In short, these claims are not “single means” claims because they are not “means” claims at all. Also, even if one were to consider them to be “means” claims, the claim language does not cover every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose; therefore, they would not be considered to be single means claims.

**[00011]** First, according to the MPEP 2181, “Applicants...have an opportunity and obligation to specify...when a claim limitation invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.” Accordingly, Applicant takes this opportunity to respectfully submit that these claims (claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26-28) are not intended to be “means or step plus function” claims. These claims are not intended to invoke 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6.

**[00012]** The Examiner has not provided any analysis from which he drew his conclusion that these claims are to be interpreted under § 112, ¶ 6. MPEP 2181 does provide the examining corps with some guidelines on how to determine whether a claim is to be interpreted under § 112, ¶ 6. The Examiner has not referenced any portion of MPEP 2181. Applicant respectfully submits that without such an analysis on the record that the Examiner cannot maintain the assertion that these claims are to be interpreted under § 112, ¶ 6.

[00013] Second, Applicant submits that even if one were to consider these claims to be “means” claims, the claim language does not cover every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose; therefore, they would not be considered to be single means claims.

[00014] Notably, MPEP 2164.08(a) specifically states:

A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered **every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose** was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim **because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.**). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to *Hyatt* is possible, **where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor.**

[00015] Each of these claims follows a pattern of an apparatus (e.g., “A DVD player” of claim 7) being configured to perform the actions of the method of a base claim from which that claim depends. First, these claims have been amended to change “that performs” to “configured to perform.” That change may adjust the Examiner’s misinterpretation of these claims. Second, these claims refer to multiple actions of the base method claim. The actions from the base claim’s method are described in the specification to meet enablement requirement. Consequently, if one were to misunderstand these claims to be “means” claims, then these actions of the base method claim would be mislabeled “means.” Since these mislabeled “means.” are well described and enabled in the specification, then MPEP 2164.08(a) does not apply. In

other words, less than every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose is claimed.

[00016] For the above stated reasons, these claims are not “single means” claims because they are not “means” claims at all. Also, even if one were to consider them to be “means” claims, the claim language does not cover every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose. Therefore, these claims are not “single means” claims and MPEP 2164.08(a) does not apply. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

**Claims 1-5, 11-17, and 20 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101**

[00017] Claims 1-5, 11-13, 16-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**Independent Claims 1 and 13**

[00018] Examiner indicates claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because “applicant’s method steps are not tied to a particular machine and do not perform a transformation.” *See, Office Action at page 3-4.*

[00019] Amended claims 1 and 13 recite in part: “identifying, by one or more **multimedia devices that facilitate access** to a multimedia presentation.” Specifically, these claims comply with 35 the requirements of U.S.C. § 101 because they are tied to

a particular machine that "facilitates access to a multimedia presentation." The support for these amendments can be found in the Specification in at least page 16, line 8.

**[00020]** Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections should be withdrawn.

**Dependent Claims 2-5, 11-12, 16-17, and 20**

**[00021]** Claims 2-5, 11-12, 16-17, and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 13. As discussed above, claims 1 and 13 comply with the patentability requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Therefore, claims 2-5, 11-12, 16-17, and 20 are also patentable for at least their dependency from patentable base claims.

**Claims 9 and 26 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101**

**[00022]** Claims 9 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner indicates that since the "broadcast point can be a website, therefore, the claimed broadcast point can be software per se, which is non-statutory subject matter." Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

**[00023]** Amended claims 9 and 26 recites in part "a transmission interface configured to transmit multimedia presentation content...." So, contrary to the Examiner's assertion related to the unamended claim language, "a transmission

interface configured to transmit multimedia presentation content is not "software per se." One can find out more about this transmission interface in the Specification in at least page 17, line 16 to page 19, line 4.

**[00024]** Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 moot. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections should be withdrawn.

#### **Cited Documents**

**[00025]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- *Boston: Boston, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0235392
- *Imahashi: Imahashi, et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0001023
- *Kanda: Kanda*, U.S. Patent No. 6,324,335
- *Sturgeon: Sturgeon, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,429,879
- *Yamauchi: Yamauchi, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,336,002
- *Saeki: Saeki, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,078,727
- *Sullivan: Sullivan*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0030665

**Document Cited in Rejection Fails to Anticipate Claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26**

**[00026]** Claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Boston. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

**Dependent Claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26**

**[00027]** The Examiner rejects claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26 on the basis that:

7. Claims 8-10, 18-19, 21-24 and 26-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boston et al (US 2003/0.235,392 A1).

For claim 8, Boston et al teach a DVD player that implements the method of claim 7, wherein the medium is a DVD disc (paragraph 68 of Boston disclose a DVD player. While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971); In re Danyl, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original), see MPEP 2114).

**[00028]** Applicant respectfully submits that MPEP § 2114 do not apply to these claims. For example, claim 8 recites "a DVD player configured to perform the method of

claim 7, and wherein the medium is a DVD disc.” The Examiner cites *Boston* as anticipating this claim. See *Office Action*, page 5. However, *Boston* merely describes a DVD as “an improved storage standard that holds at least 4.6 gigabytes” and not as “a **DVD player configured to perform the method of claim 7,**” as recited by this claim. See, *Boston*, paragraph 68, 79.

[00029] Consequently, Applicant submits that *Boston* does not anticipate this claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim. Furthermore, the above reasoning also applies with equal force to claims 9-10, 18-19, 21-24, and 26, because *Boston* does not disclose all of the claimed features of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

### **Imahashi et al. Fails to Anticipate Claims 1 and 33**

[00030] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every feature of the rejected claim. Furthermore, the features disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.

### **Based upon Imahashi**

[00031] The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Imahashi. Based on the clarifying amendments and the reason given below, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.



### Independent Claim 1

[00032] The Examiner indicated the following with regard to this claim:

For Claim 1, Imahashi et al teach identifying multimedia elements having a single linear time-code number (e.g. abstract, paragraphs 1, 169-170, figures 13-14 and 16, each picture of the video stream corresponds to the claimed multimedia elements); adding prefix value to linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia elements (e.g. figures 9 and 11A, LTC stands for linear time code, and "DATA ID (= LTC)" is considered to be the prefix since it comes before the LTC); and adding suffix values to the linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element ("DATA ID( = Ancillary Data)" is considered to be the suffix since it comes after the LTC).

[00033] In short, Applicant submits that *Imahashi* does not anticipate this claim because *Imahashi* does not disclose at least the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

A method comprising:  
identifying, by one or more multimedia devices that facilitate access to a multimedia presentation, **multiple multimedia elements sharing a common single linear time-code value**;  
producing a **unique extended time-code number** for each of the multiple identified multimedia elements, the unique extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements **comprising the common single linear time-code value, one or more prefix values, and one or more suffix values**, the producing further comprising:  
generating the **one or more prefix values for each unique extended time-code number** of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements;  
generating the **one or more suffix values for each unique extended time-code number** of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements,  
wherein the **one or more prefix values, the one or more suffix values, or combination thereof differentiate the unique extended time-code number** of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements, thereby making the extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements **unique relative** to each other.

[00034] For instance, *Imahashi* discloses a “Data ID(=LTC)” [and] “Data ID(=Ancillary Data),” which the Examiner indicated might be “prefix” and “suffix.” But, the claimed **“sharing a common single linear time-code value”** is not disclosed by *Imahashi*’s “Data ID(=LTC)” and “Data ID(=Ancillary Data).” There is no indication in *Imahashi* that its added time-code involves a “shar[ed],” “common” and “single” numerical value. See, *Imahashi*, paragraphs 169-170.

[00035] Further, this claim recites **“a unique extended time-code for each multiple identified multimedia elements.”** *Imahashi* does not disclose **“a unique extended time-code** comprising the **common single linear time-code value**, one or more prefix values, and one or more suffix values . . . wherein the one or more prefix values, the one or more suffix values, or **combination thereof differentiate the unique extended time-code number** of each of the multiple multimedia elements, thereby making the extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements unique relative to each other.”

[00036] Additionally, *Imahashi* discloses generating an encoded stream having a time-code for each frame of the source video data. See, *Imahashi*, at paragraph 20. Nowhere does *Imahashi* disclose **“generating the one or more prefix values for each unique extended time-code number . . . generating the one or more suffix values for each unique extended time-code number** of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements,” as recited by this claim.

**[00037]** In sum, *Imahashi* lacks at least the following features of this claim:

- “multiple multimedia elements sharing a common single linear time-code value;”
- “producing a unique extended time-code number for each of the multiple identified multimedia elements, the unique extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements comprising the common single linear time-code value, one or more prefix values, and one or more suffix values . . . wherein the one or more prefix values, the one or more suffix values, or combination thereof differentiate the unique extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements,”
- “generating the one or more prefix values for each unique extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements; generating the one or more suffix values for each unique extended time-code number of each of the multiple identified multimedia elements,”

**[00038]** Therefore, *Imahashi* does not disclose all of the features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that *Imahashi* does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

**Independent Claim 33**

**[00039]** The Examiner indicated the following with regards to this claim:

For claim 33, Imahashi et al teach a multimedia device comprising: a processor (e.g. paragraph 50-51, receiver system 3 is consider to be the processor); a multimedia storage module executable on the processor and configured to store multimedia presentation content comprising of multimedia elements (e.g. figure 1, paragraph 50 and 51, video frames are stored in the VTR 40 by the receiver system 3); and an extended time-code number module executable on the processor configured to append extended time-code numbers to multimedia element without a time-code number, wherein each multimedia element has a single time-code number (e.g. paragraph 51, figures 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16A, the time code in figures 1 or 11 are append on each video as shown in figures 13-14 and 16A, also see abstract, paragraphs 1, 169-170).

**[00040]** In short, Applicant submits that *Imahashi* does not anticipate this claim because it does not disclose at least the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

A multimedia device comprising:  
a processor;  
**a receiver configured to receive multimedia elements;**  
**a multimedia storage module configured to store the received multimedia elements** into a physical computer-readable storage media; and  
**an extended time-code number module executable on the processor and configured to generate and append a unique extended time-code numbers to each received multimedia element without a time-code number,** the unique extended time-code of each of the multimedia elements comprising a linear time-code value, one or more prefix values, and one or more suffix values, **wherein the one or more prefix values, the one or more suffix values, or combination thereof differentiate the unique extended time-code number of each of the multimedia elements,** thereby making the extended time-code number of each of each of the multiple multimedia elements unique relative to each other.

[00041] With regard to this claim (as amended herein), Applicant submits that *Imahashi* does not disclose (with emphasis added) “an **extended time-code number module executable on the processor and configured to generate and append a unique extended time-code numbers to each received multimedia element without a time-code number**, the unique extended time-code of each of the multimedia elements **comprising a linear time-code value, one or more prefix values, and one or more suffix values, wherein the one or more prefix values, the one or more suffix values, or combination thereof differentiate** the unique extended time-code number of each of the multimedia elements.”

[00042] While *Imahashi* discloses the addition of a time-code to the video elementary stream, there is nothing in *Imahashi* to indicate that its time code is equivalent to the claimed “**unique extended time-code numbers ... received [by] multimedia elements without a time-code number**,” as recited by this claim. Specifically, *Imahashi's* does not disclose a unique extended time-code for each multimedia elements “**comprising a linear time-code value, one or more prefix values, and one or more suffix values, or combination thereof [to] differentiate the unique extended time-code number** of each of the multimedia elements.” See, *Imahashi*, at figure 13 and paragraphs 169-170.

[00043] Consequently, *Imahashi* does not disclose all of the features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that *Imahashi* does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

**Claims 3, 11, 13, 14, and 17 Are Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al.* and further in view of *Kanda*.**

**Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)**

[00044] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case have not been met.

**Based upon *Imahashi* and *Kanda***

[00045] The Examiner rejects claims 3, 11, 13, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and further in view of *Kanda*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

**Independent Claim 13**

[00046] The Examiner indicated the following with regard to this claim:

For claim 13, *Imahashi et al* teach a method comprising: a particular multimedia presentation content comprised of multimedia elements described by extended time-code numbers, wherein the multimedia elements have a single extended time code (e.g. figure 16A, abstract, paragraphs 1);

*Imahashi et al* fail to teach the title value and searching for particular multimedia elements based on their extended time-code number. *Kanda* teaches the title value and searching for particular multimedia elements based on their extended time-code number (e.g. column 26, lines 45-62, the CPU refers to the time code to search the recording address of the video data for reproduction, figure 8 shows the "Title" which is 16 bit). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to incorporate the teaching of Kanda into the teaching of Imahashi et al to rapidly reproduce the video data (e.g. Kanda, column 26, lines 60-63).

[00047] In short, Applicant submits that the combination of *Imahashi* and *Kanda* does not disclose, teach or suggests at least the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

A method comprising:

**obtaining a specific title value and one or more specific suffix values**, the specific title value and the one or more specific suffix values being associated with multimedia presentation content of particular multimedia elements;

**searching—by one or more multimedia devices** that facilitate access to a multimedia presentation—for the particular multimedia presentation elements amongst multiple multimedia presentation elements **based on the obtained specific title value and the one or more specific suffix values**, wherein each of the particular multimedia elements have an extended time-code number, each extended time-code number comprising a linear time-code value, one or more title values, and one or more suffix values;

**obtaining a specific linear time-code value associated with the multimedia presentation content** of a specific multimedia element of the particular multimedia elements; and

**searching for, based upon the obtained specific linear time-code value**, the specific multimedia element of the particular multimedia elements.

[00048] The Examiner acknowledged that *Imahashi* does not teach “the title value and searching for particular elements based on their extended time-code numbers.” See, *Office Action*, page 8. The Examiner therefore relies on *Kanda* for this teaching.

[00049] The Examiner indicates that *Kanda* discloses “the CPU [as] refer[ing] to the time-code to search the recording address of the video data for reproduction [and] figure 8 shows the ‘Title’ which is 16 bit.” However, at least, the feature of “searching . . . **based on the obtained specific title value and the one or more specific suffix values**, wherein each **multimedia elements have an extended time-code number**,

each extended time-code number comprising a linear time-code, one or more title values, and one or more suffix values" as recited in this claim, is missing from *Kanda*, *Imahashi* and any other cited reference.

[00050] In addition, *Kanda* fails to remedy the deficiency of *Imahashi* regarding the title value as recited by this claim. *Kanda* does not disclose a **"specific title value and one or more specific suffix values, the specific title value and the one or more specific suffix values being associated with multimedia presentation content of particular multimedia elements."** Instead, the "Title" in *Kanda* is merely used to display the title in a title displaying area and not as recited in this claim. See, *Kanda* column 19, line 30-34.

[00051] Further, *Kanda* and any other cited reference does not teach or disclose **"obtaining a specific linear time-code value associated with the multimedia presentation content of a specific multimedia element of the particular multimedia elements, and searching for, based upon the obtained specific linear time-code value, the specific multimedia element of the particular multimedia elements,"** as recited in this claim.

[00052] Thus, for at least the above reasons, the combination of *Imahashi* and *Kanda* and any other cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim.



### **No Reason to Combine References**

**[00053]** On page 8 of the Action, the Examiner indicates that the two references should be combined stating that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Kanda* into the teaching of *Imahashi et al* to rapidly reproduce video data.” See, *Office Action*, page 8. Applicant respectfully submits that this reasoning is improper.

**[00054]** The Examiner has not indicated how incorporating *Kanda* into *Imahashi* has advantaged *Imahashi* according to the asserted reason (“...to rapidly reproduce video data”). Since *Imahashi* already discloses “**adding the time-code to the video elementary stream**” and *Kanda* discloses “**allocating a time code to each video frame**.” See, *Kanda*, column 26, line 39-40. How then is allocating a time code to each video frame of material advantage to *Imahashi*? Specifically, how is the allocation of a time-code to a video frame advantageous to “rapidly reproduc[ing] video data”? The Applicant submits that it is not.

**[00055]** Applicant submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art, having common sense at the time of the invention would not have reasonably looked to *Kanda* for a solution to a problem already solved by *Imahashi*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

**Dependent Claims 3, 11, and 17**

[00056] Claims 3, 11, and 17 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 13. As discussed above, claims 1 and 13 are patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 3, 11, and 17 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

**Claim 4 Is Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al* and further in view of *Sturgeon et al.***

[00057] Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and further in view of *Sturgeon*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claim 4**

[00058] Claim 4 ultimately depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 4 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

**Claim 16 Is Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al* and *Kanda* and further in view of *Sturgeon et al.***

[00059] Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and *Kanda*, and further in view of *Sturgeon*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claim 16**

[00060] Claim 16 ultimately depends from independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 16 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

**Claims 2 and 12 Are Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al* and further in view of the Prior Art section of the instant application.**

[00061] Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and further in view of the cited Art section of the instant application. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claims 2 and 12**

[00062] Claims 2 and 12 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2 and 12 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

**Claims 5 and 7 Are Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al.* and further in view of *Yamauchi et al.***

[00063] Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and further in view of *Yamauchi*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[00064] Dependent Claims 5 and 7 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 5 and 7 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

**Claims 6, 37, and 38 Are Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al.* and further in view of *Saeki et al.***

[00065] Claims 6, 37, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and further in view of *Saeki*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claims 6, 37, and 38**

[00066] Dependent claims 6, 37, and 38 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and 33. As discussed above, claim 1 and 33 are patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 6, 37, and 38 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

**Claim 20 Is Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al.* and *Kanda* and further in view of *Saeki et al.***

[00067] Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and *Kanda*, and further in view of *Saeki*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claim 20**

[00068] Claim 20 ultimately depends from independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 20 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

**Claims 34 and 35 Are Non-Obvious Over *Imahashi et al.* and *Kanda*, and further in view of cited Art section of the instant application.**

[00069] Claims 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *Imahashi* and *Kanda*, and further in view of cited Art section of the instant application. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claims 34 and 35**

[00070] Claims 34 and 35 ultimately depend from independent claim 33. As discussed above, claim 33 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 34 and 35 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

[00071] For example, claim 34 recites "a multimedia player configured to play multiple multimedia elements, which **include the received multimedia elements**, and further **configured to search the multiple identified multimedia elements** based on one or more of the following: **a specific extended time-code number**, one or more **specific prefix values**, or one or more **specific suffix values**," which is not disclosed in any of the cited references.

### Conclusion

[00072] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/kaseychristie40559/

Dated: 6/26/2009

Kasey C. Christie (kasey@leehayes.com; 509-944-4732)  
Registration No. 40,559